

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of: Mohn, et al.

Serial No.: 09/611,817

Confirmation No.: 6787

Filed:

July 7, 2000

For:

Multi-Purpose Processing

Chamber With Removable

Chamber Liner

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir or Madam:

 $oldsymbol{\omega}$

Group Art Unit:

1763

Examiner:

Anna M. Crowell

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited on August ___/8___, 2004 with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

8 //8/0 Y Date

ignature

REPLY BRIEF

Applicants submit this Reply Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on appeal from the decision of the Examiner of Group Art Unit 1763 dated December 29, 2003, finally rejecting claims 1-11, 13-15, 21, 24, 25, and 34-36. Three copies of this brief are submitted for use by the Board.

I. THE EXAMINER ERRED IN REJECTING CLAIMS 1-4, 13-15, AND 24-25 UNDER U. S. C. § 112 SECOND PARAGRAPH BECAUSE THE CLAIMS CLEARLY DESCRIBE THE INTERNAL VOLUME OF A CHAMBER.

The Examiner argues that the term "substantially tangent" should be given its common meaning and that the degree of substantially tangent is unclear. The Examiner also argues that the claim does not preclude the chamber body from having

an internal volume and outer surfaces of the sidewalls being substantially tangent to the outer surfaces of the cylindrical regions.

The claim language specifically defines the chamber body by describing its internal volume as two cylindrical regions and a region formed by two side walls that are substantially tangent to the cylindrical regions. The exact language is, "a chamber body having an internal volume defined by first and second substantially cylindrical regions and by side walls extending substantially tangent between the first and second substantially cylindrical regions." Only an interior surface of the sidewalls can be used to define an internal volume. Examples of substantially tangent sidewalls are shown in Figures 6B to 6C. The sidewalls 204C in Figures 6B and 6C are about tangent to the cylindrical regions formed by the substrate support 216 and the exhaust region above the gas outlet 208. Applicant respectfully requests reversal of the rejection.

II. THE EXAMINER ERRED IN REJECTING CLAIM 1 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(B) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER TEPMAN, ET AL. BECAUSE THE CLAIMS DEFINE AN INTERIOR VOLUME NOT TAUGHT OR SUGGESTED BY THE REFERENCE.

The Examiner asserts that the claimed apparatus does not define structurally over *Tepman* because the top view of Figure 1 of *Tepman* shows inner sidewalls 20 that are substantially tangent to the two cylindrical regions.

Tepman teaches a chamber body defining two cylindrical regions connected by an exhaust orifice 22 in a base 20. Contrary to the assertion by the Examiner, Figure 1 of Tepman does not show or suggest that the inner surfaces of the exhaust orifice 22 in the base 20 are substantially tangent to the cylindrical regions. Applicant respectfully requests reversal of the rejection.

III. THE EXAMINER ERRED IN REJECTING CLAIMS 2-4 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER *TEPMAN, ET AL*. IN VIEW OF *BENJAMIN, ET AL*. BECAUSE THE REFERENCES DO NOT TEACH OR SUGGEST THE INTERNAL VOLUME RECITED IN THE CLAIMS.

The Examiner assets that the combination of *Benjamin* and *Tepman* shows the features of claims 2-4 because it is obvious to substitute one conventional plasma generating arrangement for another.

Contrary to the assertion by the Examiner, the combination of *Benjamin* and *Tepman* does not show or suggest that the internal volume defined by substantially tangent sidewalls as recited in base claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests reversal of the rejection.

IV. THE EXAMINER ERRED IN REJECTING CLAIMS 11, 13-15, 21, AND 24-25 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER *TEPMAN*, *ET AL*. IN VIEW OF *SHAN*, *ET AL*. BECAUSE *TEPMAN*, *ET AL*. DOES NOT TEACH OR SUGGEST A LINER IN AN INTERNAL VOLUME DEFINED BY THE STRAIGHT AND SUBSTANTIALLY TANGENT SIDE WALLS.

The Examiner indicates that it would be obvious to provide liners to both the first and second cylindrical regions of *Tepman* as taught by *Shan*.

Contrary to the assertion by the Examiner, the combination of *Shan* and *Tepman* does not show or suggest that the internal volume defined by substantially tangent sidewalls as recited in base claims 11 and 21.

Futhermore, *Tepman* teaches away from the use of liners. *Tepman* teaches the desirability of interchanging the entire processing chamber (column 13, line 7 to column 14, line 22) including a replaceable base 20 that negates the need for a liner. Hence, the *Tepman* and *Shan* references alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the subject matter of claim 11, 13-15, 21, and 24-25. Applicants respectfully request reversal of the rejection.

Conclusion

The specification adequately defines substantially tangent by showing several embodiments. *Tepman, et al., Shan, et al.*, and *Benjamin, et al.*, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest an internal volume defined by first and second substantially cylindrical regions and by side walls substantially tangent to the first and second substantially cylindrical regions. Therefore, the rejections made by the Examiner should be reversed. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reversal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1-4, 11, 13-15, 21, and 24-25.

Respectfully submitted,

Keith M. Tackett

Registration No. 32,008

MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.

3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500

Houston, TX 77056

Telephone: (713) 623-4844 Facsimile: (713) 623-4846

Agent for Applicant(s)

295759_1